

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET

MINUTES OF COMMUNITIES, TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND SCRUTINY PANEL MEETING

Monday, 13th March, 2017

Present:- **Councillors** John Bull, Brian Simmons, Alan Hale, Neil Butters, Lizzie Gladwyn, Bob Goodman, Ian Gilchrist and Jasper Becker (in place of Peter Turner)

136 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Chairman welcomed everyone to the meeting.

137 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Chairman drew attention to the emergency evacuation procedure.

138 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Councillor Peter Turner sent his apologies and was substituted by Councillor Jasper Becker.

139 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

140 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There was none.

141 ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC OR COUNCILLORS - TO RECEIVE DEPUTATIONS, STATEMENTS, PETITIONS OR QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE BUSINESS OF THIS MEETING

Public Statements

Adam Reynolds made a statement regarding Bath Quays Bridge

A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.

The Chair stated that the statement and questions would be passed on to the Cabinet Member for Transport.

Anne Forrest made a statement regarding Claverton Street Subway. She stated that there is no safe pedestrian route into the city.

Richard Samuel made a statement regarding Air Quality which raised some questions. The Chair stated that he hoped the Panel would raise these points in debate (at minute number 146).

Note - before Mr Samuel made his statement, he declared that he was a candidate in the Walcot by-election and asked if he could still speak. The Chairman advised that he could speak on other matters but not in his capacity as a candidate. Mr Samuel confirmed he would not.

A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.

David Redgewell made a statement regarding Transport.

A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.

Regarding a query from Councillor Butters on the BTP (British Transport Police), Mr Redgewell explained that he understood the proposal was to relocate to Swindon station. Councillor Hale stated that he shared concerns about the effective lack of policing of the area. Councillor Romero stated that she will take these points to the PCC Panel. The Cabinet member stated that the administration has been disturbed by the decision made regarding the police without consultation. He added that the new Headquarters in Bath is not fit for purpose and assured the Panel that this is a major issue for the administration. Councillor Hale asked that the Cabinet member raise these concerns at every opportunity. The Chair noted that the Cabinet members agreed and it was accepted that this issue (British Transport Police) be added to the Panel work plan.

Andy Halliday made a statement regarding Bath Central Library. He stated that use of the integrated One Stop Shop and Library in Keynsham is totally different to the Podium usage and that facilities in Bath are on one floor where people feel safe and welcome.

The Chair asked what the difference would be if the Library moved to Lewis House. Mr Halliday explained that there would be a reduction of books, children's space, access to reference books, access to reserve stock. There would also be the loss of the city centre location, single floor facility and close car parking. There was some discussion about how a change in parking facilities would affect usage.

Gillian Risbridger made a statement regarding Air Quality Action Plan. *A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.*

Caroline Ambrose made a statement regarding Bath Central Library size.

A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.

Annie Kilvington made a statement regarding Air Quality. *A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.*

Sian James made a statement regarding Air Quality.

Dr Jacqui Hughes – SOS Group made a statement regarding SOS (Sort our Subway) Claverton Street Subway.

A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.

Public Questions

The Chair referred to the circulated list of questions from members of the public and the answers provided. *A copy of this document is attached to the minutes and available on the Council's minute book.*

Questions were received from:

Fiona Powell
Mark Magri-Overend
Sian James

142 MINUTES 16 JANUARY 2017

The Panel confirmed the minutes of the previous meeting as a true record and they were signed by the Chairman.

143 LIBRARIES - UPDATE

Ian Savigar Divisional Director Customer Services, gave a presentation to the Panel which covered the following:

- Where we are now
- Potential B&NES Library Service Model by 2020
- Some key facts
- What is happening
- Why would we do this?
- Has the decision been made yet?
- What can't things stay the same?
- Other Libraries
- Midsomer Norton
- Current Issues

The Divisional Director explained that there was no plan to close any libraries and the Council will work with communities. He added that in the early summer, a business case would be submitted to the Cabinet and then there would be a second stage of consultation. Regarding the mobile library service he explained that there have been a few issues over the last few months due to driver illness and vehicle repairs but these have now resolved. Regarding the event space he explained that the rolling stack needs to be repaired. He concluded that savings can be achieved, improvements delivered with a modernized option.

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Councillor Bull asked that in the future, slides be provided at an earlier stage.

Councillor Gilchrist asked if there will be an equivalent exhibition space in the new configuration. The officer stated that if consultation shows that this is needed then something will be worked out.

Councillor Goodman asked if local reference books were being moved to the Guildhall without a formal decision on the Libraries yet. The officer explained that this is a separate issue and not part of the Library proposals.

Councillor Butters stated that the usage rate at Bath Library is impressive and a lot of users park in the Waitrose car park, he asked if it was anticipated that the usage would drop if the Library was moved. The officer stated that he did not have information on modes of transport of Library users but that there were car parks near Lewis House (Manvers Street and Southgate). Councillor Butters asked if Manvers Street car park will eventually be removed. The officer stated that there is no plan for this at present. Andrew Pate, Strategic Director for Resources added that if the move does go ahead, parking requirements would have to be taken into account.

Councillor Bull asked how much of the proposed savings of £800k applies to the Central Bath Library and also if it is true that some Council staff will be moving to the Podium. The Strategic Director explained that £700k is the target saving in year 3 of the budget plan and that the business plan will detail how much of that relates to Bath Central Library. He explained that there is a provisional sum in the Capital Programme which will enable investment in the Library Service and that this will need to be funded which can only be done by making the service more efficient. The plan is to combine services to reduce staff costs. Councillor Bull asked if a move to Lewis House would make any savings or if the proposed savings would all come from staff costs. The Strategic Director explained that savings would be made by integrating services by putting them at the same location, he added that a decision has not yet been made on what that location will be. Councillor Bull asked what the integration would involve. The Divisional Director explained that in Keynsham work is being done on a generic customer services operating model.

Councillor Goodman asked where the Library would go in the time where work is being done to both the buildings in the plan. The officer explained that this detail would be in the business case. The Strategic Director added that some consultation has been done and Lewis House drawings were used but the key point should be emphasized which is the integration of services. Councillor Bull stated that the press release implied a move to Lewis House which has been misleading. The Strategic Director explained that this has been clarified.

Councillor Butters asked if there are any figures on the reduction of space, the officer explained that there is no decision yet on which space will be used. Councillor Butters asked about the mobile library service and at what point there will be a balance sheet for Cabinet to consider. The officer explained that there is no plan to stop the mobile library service and that a business case would be submitted to the Cabinet in early summer.

Councillor Gladwyn asked about the integration of staff skills and asked if there would still be librarians with their specialist skills. The officer explained that the integration is being trialled in Keynsham and he has found that staff want to learn more skills with changing roles. Councillor Hale asked that disadvantaged people should not be forgotten in the integration plans. The officer explained that this has been one of the strengths in Keynsham in that use of the Library has been encouraged.

Councillor Bull stated that the Panel would consider this issue again after the second consultation.

144 CHURCHILL SUBWAY

Dr Jacqui Hughes of SOS (Sort our Subway) Group made a statement.
A copy of the statement is attached to the minutes and is available on the Council's minute book for this Panel.

Gary Peacock Deputy Group Manager, gave a presentation to the Panel which covered the following:

- Claverton Street Subway – map and pictures
- Costed options (Options 1, 2 and 3)
- Atkins Recommendations
- Figure A1: Churchill Bridge Crossing Options Tested
- Summary
- Recommendation

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

The Chairman, Councillor Bull, explained that some members had a site visit to the subway earlier in the day. He further explained that the Panel could not make a decision on the options today but could make a recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Clarke.

Councillor Hale asked what the costings would be to align the lights on a possible new crossing with the lights further along. The officer explained that the traffic signals at Rossiter Road run for long cycles whereas a pedestrian crossing is demand led. The officer added that he did not believe that linking the lights would bring the desired results.

Councillor Butters asked if Equal Opportunities and wheelchair users had been taken into account and if the potential arches refurbishment would need a crossing. He also asked if the possibility of a footbridge had been exhausted. The officer responded that there is wheelchair access and that he believed the introduction of CCTV would increase security. He explained that a footbridge would cause a lot of visual impact and the arches issue cannot drive the outcome.

Councillor Becker referred to the middle surface crossing and the 30/60/90 second simulation – he asked if this test had been done for option 3. The officer explained that no, this had not been done for option 3 as it takes pedestrians passed the desire line and would be a retrograde step for pedestrians.

Councillor Bull asked if the officer has looked at other examples of refurbished subways to see if people felt safer as a result of the refurbishment. The officer said he would look into it.

Councillor Simmons stated that any scheme other than an underpass would increase traffic and pollution.

The Panel **RESOLVED** to make the following recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Transport:

The Panel recommend that officers investigate an alternative crossing, to the east of the gyratory, linked to the other crossing at Halfpenny Bridge. The Panel ask that the investigation should include the issue of air pollution and a study of outcomes in other cities.

Councillor Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport thanked the Panel.

145 RIVER SAFETY UPDATE

Cath Brown, Team Manager for Licensing and Environmental Protection, gave a presentation to the Panel which covered the following:

(The officer informed the Panel that Gareth Lloyd – Avon Fire and Rescue Station Manager had inputted into this presentation)

- River Safety update
- River Avon related incidents since 2009
- Our reports and evidence
- Our reports and evidence
- River Safety Group
- Our strategy for reducing risks
- Our improvements... fencing and signage
- River Rescue Cabinets
- Got Ya Back! Campaign
- Communications
- Avon Fire and Rescue Service update
- Future focus – review of educational campaigns

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Councillor Hale asked if there are any figures on deaths/rescue and also about how the issue of intoxication is approached. The officer explained that four fatalities have involved a night out, she explained that it is important to deliver the message that is

not patronising. She further explained that she is looking at evaluation in order to build in some measures.

Councillor Gladwyn asked if the authority will renew its support for various campaigns. She explained that she had worked with the Student Union on this. She asked about licensing conditions and training for bouncers. The officer confirmed that the authority does support campaigns and confirmed that she does speak to premises and there is an enforcement group to talk to door staff.

146 AIR QUALITY UPDATE - BATH AIR QUALITY ACTION PLAN REVIEW AND CLEAN AIR ZONE

Cath Brown, Team Manager for Licensing and Environmental Protection, and Rob Spalding, Senior Public Protection Officer, gave a presentation to the Panel which covered the following:

- Bath Air Quality Action Plan
- Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)
- Air Quality Action Plan in Bath
- How does the Bath AQAP link to our other strategies?
- Annual average NO2 levels at hotspots (2015)
- Overview of source apportionment
- Groups we have consulted with in planning for the review
- What are the themes of our action plan?
- Timeline for reviewing the Bath AQAP
- Next steps

- Clean Air Zone
- What is a Clean Air Zone (CAZ)?
- Effects and considerations of introducing a CAZ in Bath
- How does a CAZ link to our strategies?
- Next steps for CAZ

Panel members made the following points and asked the following questions:

Councillor Gilchrist asked about the management area around Widcombe and asked if it could be redrawn and also why Pultney Road is not included. The officer explained that the management area represents an area where NO2 exceeds the recommended level, this can be due to the layout of buildings as high sided buildings trap air pollution.

Councillor Hale pointed to the high levels in Bathwick Street and London Road and asked if this would be different if HGV vehicles used a link road. The officer said that there would be some difference, he explained that this would necessitate a costly survey whereas the authority relies on traffic modelling data. He explained that he is overseeing a brief on traffic modelling and asking for it to take air pollution into account.

Councillor Butters asked that the public speaker Richard Samuel's questions be addressed (*a copy of this statement is saved as an attachment to the minutes and kept on the Council's minute book*). Cath Brown, Team Manager for Licensing and Environmental Protection, addressed the issues. She explained that bid to DEFRA was not successful but there are other strategies with income streams such as Devolution. Regarding the boundary of management areas, she explained that this is based on the outcome of the data. Rob Spalding, Senior Public Protection Officer, explained that the chosen approach has been to focus on area where there are exceedances.

The Chair asked officers to find if there had been a traffic census on London Road.

Councillor Clarke, Cabinet Member for Transport, explained that there is no doubt that something has to be done to address the NO2 levels in Bath but explained that some of the roads are trunk roads and the authority does not have the right to impose clean air areas. He explained that the one part of the city that could be isolated is the centre. He further explained that the administration would persist in looking to get bypasses to make the authority a clean air zone. He added that the correct amount of monitoring is being done and that this authority is not high on the list as pollution levels are not high enough. He informed the Panel that he had written to the Chair of the Licensing Committee asking about regulating taxi's in terms of pollution and diesel cars.

Councillor Butters mentioned a TV programme where pollution equipment was attached to a bike and a taxi which revealed that the taxi driver experienced higher levels of air pollution than the cyclist.

Councillor Simmons stated that diffusion tubes give three monthly averages and suggested the use of a gas analyser to show different levels at different times. The officer explained that there are automatic monitors which can be moved every three months.

Councillor Bull asked if we could prohibit engines staying idling, the officer explained that a CAZ is not needed for that.

147 CABINET MEMBER UPDATE

The Cabinet Member for Transport, Councillor Clarke updated the Panel on the following:

- Metro West rail project – meeting with Joint Transport Board;
- Traffic Transport Strategy commission meeting – a delivery plan will be published next month;
- Parking Review – draft by the end of the month;
- The Bus Service Bill is going through;
- A37 is on the radar along with the special strategy and air quality.

148 PANEL WORKPLAN

The Panel noted the workplan with the following additions:

- Bus Services Bill
- Metro West (May)
- British Transport Police

The meeting ended at 8.25 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services

This page is intentionally left blank

Adam Reynolds statement to CTE Panel – 13th March 2017

Quays Bridge/CAF2 Timeline:

Jan 2015 :- Council worked with CycleBath puts in bid for towpath, Locksbrook Bridge renovation, and new Widcombe Bridge.

Mar 2015 :- Bath wins £3.8M to build Widcombe Bridge, Rennovate Locksbrook Bridge, and upgrade towpath.

Sep 2015 :- Bath Quays Competition for £2.5M cycle/foot bridge

Nov 2015 :- Bath Quays Bridge Chosen

Jan 2016 :- Council applies to DfT for change to CAF2 funding to:

“To allocate £3.137m as a contribution towards the proposed Bath Quays Bridge within Bath’s Enterprise Area and to the development and implementation of cycle schemes to improve links between the Bath Quays Bridge, the Enterprise Area and other areas of Bath.”

Mar-June 2016 : DfT approve change.

Mar 2017 : Bridge planning approval given.

So what happened to the original £2.5M?

Would the bridge not have been built if it wasn't for CAF2? Funding was in place for the bridge and suddenly it wasn't when CAF2 came along.

What role did officers have in budgeting and where has this £2.5M hole in the Bath Enterprise Area finances gone?

Will the council recognise the role CAF2 money will have in the uplift values of the sale of apartments and commercial rents and create a CAF2 re-imbursement fund specifically ringfenced for cycle infrastructure projects with a broader remit than just connecting to the Bath Enterprise Area?

CycleBath has no objection to the bridge. With good segregated cycle lanes on Lower Bristol Road and eventual closure of the Pines Way gyratory it will be a vital connection between the city centre and Oldfield Park and Twerton.

We just want to understand why the council has allowed a funded bridge to lose its funding and be rescued by re-allocated cycling money that was going to provide real benefit to Twerton, Locksbrook, and Widcombe communities and that this lost cycle investment will be recompensed from the revenue generated from the South and North Quays developments.

This page is intentionally left blank

Communities, Transport and Environment PDS

13th March 2017

Richard Samuel

Agenda item 11

I wish to raise four issues with the panel for action.

1 The Council's failure to secure funding from DEFRA is a serious concern in itself. However what is far more concerning that the Council's current administration clearly considers clean air action to be a low priority because it has failed to allocate the necessary funds in its recent budget when it could so easily have done so. I call on the panel to examine why this is the case.

2. On behalf of residents in Camden I make the point that whilst measured levels of toxic pollutants may be slightly lower in our area than on the London Road they are still harmful to health and action is required. Camden Residents Association wants additional air quality monitoring stations along Camden Road so that the risk can be assessed. However recent correspondence with the officers has advised us if we want additional monitoring then we will have to pay for it ourselves. So my request to this panel is that you investigate why this is the case.

3 My next point to you is to request that you consider the rationale behind the very narrowly drawn air quality management area shown in your papers when the impact of overspill traffic from the main arterial routes is now so pervasive into resident streets. The Council's own figures report that 7000 vehicles a day short cut through Camden. I ask you to consider why the map is not drawn in a holistic way to reflect driver behaviour.

4. Finally I am calling upon the panel to support a proper traffic census on Bath's most polluted roads in particular vehicles using London Road and Bathwick Street. A traffic census is not the same as a simple traffic count .What it seeks to address is why drivers use these roads, where have they come from, where are they going. I have been told by officers that no such information exists.

If the information does not exist how on earth can an evidence based approach to reducing traffic usage be developed. We know the numbers, we know the impacts, what we really need to know are the reasons behind the numbers. I repeat my request to you to examine this deficiency.

David Redgewell statement to CTE – 13th March 2017

SWTN, Railfuture and Bus Users UK wish to make the following points :-

We are very concerned over the loss of bus services if the Council's in the proposed combined authority cut bus services especially in East Bristol, Bath and Keynsham where routes under threat could include service 16 UWE - Hanham, 18A Emersons Green - Shirehampton via Bristol Parkway, 17 Keynsham - Southmead Hospital , 19/10A Bath - Cribbs Causeway, 36 South Bristol, 37 Bristol - Bath. Many of these routes are evening and Sunday services.

500 group services in Bristol (including 505, 506, 508, 512, 513, 514, 515 and rural buses in BANES re: service 267 and into South Gloucestershire (services 16 and 77 to UWE and Thornbury.

We would urge the cabinet and council not to cut services or local rail investment at a time when we are trying to build MetroBus and Metrorail. We are pleased to see new entries into the market in the form of Stagecoach Group.

We hope the council will look at bus, rail and ferry integration with Smart ticketing and transport hubs and will note the comments below:-

1) the Buses Bill and the Combined Authorities powers over the 1985 Act to support bus services and cross boundary issues with North Somerset Council which would require a permit system if the buses were franchised or special regulations for advanced quality partnerships.

2) with Rail powers we need to include over the Portishead line and Henbury loop and existing station improvements on the current rail network to Bristol, Bath and Weston-Super-Mare including access to the disabled schemes and DIA's through a memorandum of understanding with ORR and Network Rail.

3) Cross boundary rail services with Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire.

4) Budget transfer supported bus budgets from Bristol City Council, BANES and South Gloucestershire Council and the combined authorities powers over bus services let by Bristol City Council on the 7th March 2017.

5) maintenance of bus shelters and bus stations.

Thanks

DAVID REDGEWELL TSSA, Bus Users UK

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Panel Meeting 13th March 2017

According to "Getting Around Bath" adopted by the council in 2014, there is a strategy to make Bath the UK's most walkable city. However apart from a few pilot schemes and tinkering around the edges, none of the measures suggested to reduce the impact of vehicles in Bath has yet been achieved and pollution has not been reduced. Drastic action needs to be taken to effect change and whilst there are some excellent schemes being considered within this document, we do not believe this plan goes far enough to have an impact on improving the levels of air pollution in Bath.

1 Fund for tackling congestion relating to sustainable or public transport In last week's budget the chancellor announced a £690m competitive fund for tackling congestion and wants to encourage bids based on sustainable transport solutions and investment in public transport, rather than, for road building. None of the current proposals in the Bath Air Quality Action Plan Review appear to qualify for these funds, so what is the council going to bid for under this scheme? Should the Bath Air Quality Action Plan be modified to include sustainable transport solutions which would also address issues of pollution eg trams, funiculars, cable cars, or even just cycle racks on the front of buses?

2 Clean Air Zone Bath needs to adopt a Clean Air Zone restricting access to the most polluting diesel vehicles (the Class D CAZ modelled by Defra) including buses, taxis, delivery vehicles, private cars, motorcycles and mopeds. We would like an ambitious approach to allow for the total ban on certain classes of vehicles (e.g. diesel bans introduced in Paris and Madrid) and partial ban of non-ULEV vehicles in the city centre, except for residents. Without extra public funding for local government to implement CAZs, charge based restrictions (e.g. the Nottingham workplace parking levy or London's congestion charge) offer a viable means of changing people's travel behaviour. Nottingham's workplace parking levy has raised £9 million in revenue for reinvestment in transport projects across the city (eg bus and tram networks, with an associated package of support measures e.g. personal travel planning and season ticket loans) however I note that a similar scheme has not been included in the suggestions.

3 Active Travel We need to create safer more convenient conditions for active travel. It is not enough to keep saying that walking is given the highest priority in Bath and cycling second, but funds have to be made available to support improvements to both the walking and cycling environment. In addition we dispute the council figures that only 7% of traffic is down to the school run, when the national average figure is 20% and we believe this is a major contributor to congestion and air pollution in Bath. Bristol City Council currently funds a Walk to School coordinator. This led to a drop in car use of almost a third from 39 to 27 per cent within 1 year. Behaviour change interventions work best when paired with removal of barriers to walking and cycling identified by communities – for example, by linking recent Community Street Audits conducted by Sustrans to modest capital budgets. It shows how community involvement can make a tangible difference and builds confidence in local authorities.

In 3 minutes I could only cover 3 main areas we believe are fundamental to reducing Bath's air pollution over the next 5 years. However Transition Bath would like answers to the questions raised in this submission summarised below:

- 1. what is the council going to bid for under the congestion scheme announced in last week's budget?*
- 2. should the Bath Air Quality Action Plan be modified to include sustainable transport solutions which would also address issues of pollution?*
- 3. why are you not considering a more ambitious approach to allow for the total or partial ban on diesel vehicles?*
- 4. why has a workplace parking levy, modified to the needs of Bath not been included in the suggested packages?*
- 5. would consideration be given to funding a Living Streets schools post to reduce the number of children driven to school and this be included within the current review?*
- 6. can funds be found to remove barriers to walking and cycling identified by local communities*

Caroline Ambrose 13 March 2017 B&NES Communities Meeting

As a resident and frequent library user, I've been shocked by misleading statements about site space. I've emailed Martin Veal, Councillor for Libraries more than once since January *without reply*. I find this astonishing and concerning. However, Ian Savigar, Divisional Director for Libraries *did* want to meet and we had a successful meeting last week concerning site options.

The Council has committed to the city's library being the equivalent size of the Podium site. This is also extremely important to the 600+ Save Bath Library members and 5,200 petition signers.

As a senior commercial sector manager for 20 years, most recently BAA plc's 500 retail sites across UK airports including Heathrow, I know about cost efficiencies. I know about maximising space. After examining scaled Lewis House and Podium floorplans with architects, I am 100% clear Lewis House does not have this space.

Here's why: the net Podium library site is **2,284 sq metres**. The net available space for library use across five floors of Lewis House is just **1,389 sq metres**. It's questionable but not unreasonable to add displaced local archive space and an *exterior* staircase would add a little more, but even with both, Lewis House is still a floor and a half short.

Getting the equivalent space will mean building up or out, adding greatly to the already £5.9m public cost. Further, multi-level sites are highly cost inefficient and insecure. Expect to multiply, not reduce the existing library staffing spend *and* plan for security staff on top of that. That £800k saving will not happen.

So, after Ian agreed we need other options, I looked at the Podium floorplan. Ian tells me the One Stop Shop's footfall has halved, and the space, could halve too. The Council's documents show the One Stop Shop footprint as 302 sq m. Neatly, releasing the local archives from the Podium to the Guildhall creates 150 sq m. So, moving a downsized Shop up to the Podium presents a highly efficient solution.

No enormous capital cost. *Realistic* opportunities to save money. Leasing opportunities at Lewis House. I earnestly hope the Council agrees to thoroughly researching options and working transparently with campaigners and librarians to find a solution Bath can be proud of.

This page is intentionally left blank

Presentation to the Communities Transport & Environment PDS

13 March 2017

I speak to ask for 2 things:

1. That B&NES Director of Public Health take ownership of the mission to produce an aggressive, ambitious and measurable Air Quality Action Plan for Bath; and
2. That the Council consider the needs of communities outside the current AQMAs.

Both of these things are what DEFRA want Councils to do in their toolkit on Air Quality published just this month. DEFRA wants Directors of Public Health to act as leaders, influencers and scrutineers, and to shape local approaches to cleaning up our air. Yet in our Director of Public Health's 2016 Annual Report, there is but one small, oblique reference to Air Quality. Air Quality should be his cornerstone, the one public health issue that impacts on all others in his portfolio, not an afterthought. Please reassure us that Dr Laurence will be our greatest, most vocal advocate for an innovative and robust Action Plan – to declare war on air pollution in our City.

Long term exposure to PM and NO₂ emissions has a dramatic impact on human health. There are no safe levels of PM, and DEFRA stress that impacts on health for both PM and NO₂ exposure are observed *well below* the levels permitted by law. The absence of an AQMA does not mean an absence of a public health issue. In Batheaston, annual NO₂ levels are routinely in the 30s, against a legal limit of 40. But being outside the AQMA, there is no focus on air quality here, despite a major transportation proposal – the Bathampton Meadows Park & Ride, which the council itself predicts will increase NO₂ emissions in this community. Unless B&NES examine air pollution in areas outside the current AQMAs then how will DEFRA's objectives be met?

DEFRA showcase what other Councils are doing. Retrofitting council vehicles and sightseeing buses, hospital travel plans, cycle friendly measures, zero emissions initiatives for businesses, LEZs. Particularly interesting was a project in Bradford on Avon where Air Quality Groups decided to test their theory that local air pollution was caused by commuters, by commissioning an origin and destination study which revealed that in fact over 80% of the traffic air pollution was caused by residents' traffic. This focussed attention on the local nature of the problem, so that tailored solutions could be devised. Wouldn't it be wonderful if this Council could be so strategic, and invest in understanding the origin and destination of traffic on the London Road? We might discover that a congestion charge for our most polluting vehicles, however unpalatable, would be a cost effective solution, providing revenue to fund other air quality initiatives, whilst a Park & Ride in Bathampton will take few if any cars off the road and make the air breathed by its residents worse.

Annie Kilvington

This page is intentionally left blank

SOS Statement in support of a road level pedestrian crossing instead of the Claverton Street subway - for the March 13th 2017 CTE Panel

A. Our Heritage City is let down by the subway

1. **Claverton Street subway** provides the **key entry to, and exit from, our World Heritage City** for people who live, or are staying, in the south west of Bath. **Hundreds of people** use it each day. The subway is a **dirty, unpleasant and unsafe** legacy of 1960s planning {see photo annex 1}. It is **unfit for purpose** and would **not be contemplated today**. It would be wrong to retain it simply because it still exists.

B. Residents want a road level pedestrian crossing not a subway. Mr Peacock's paper does not reflect residents' views or our work with the Council on this issue.

1. The **SOS group** is made up of key people from **Bear Flat, Greenway Lane, Widcombe and Widcombe West Residents' Associations and Art in the Arch** . It has sought the **views of local residents** (survey [see annex 2], meetings, petition) and the **overwhelming majority want a crossing** instead of the **subway**.

2. A **crossing** would either a) go **over the gyratory** or b) cross **39 metres to the east of gyratory**, in a similar position and distance to the crossing on the west (Lower Bristol Road) side of the gyratory or c) cross **44 metres to the east of the subway** as identified in **16/1/17 report Mr Peacock commissioned***

3. **SOS** has **worked with Councillor Clarke and Mr Peacock** for almost a year. **Mr Peacock's paper** does not reflect our views. **Nor** does it reflect **our work together**, where the **concerns raised by Mr Peacock** in his paper have **already been largely addressed**. It was in fact **Mr Peacock** who suggested option c) above *

C. Capital & revenue costs for a subway are very high compared to a foot crossing

1. The **costed options** to ensure that the **subway is safe and fit for purpose** are **high**. The **capital cost** for the suggested **subway option** is **£315,000**. There will be **ongoing maintenance costs** to address further **flooding, cleaning, graffiti CCTV**.

2. The Council's consultant, Atkins, indicated that **renovations** to meet **Government Design Manual for Roads** and **Bridges safety standards** would be **even higher - £460,000**, with a **further £65 K** for **CCTV**, a communication link and pumped drainage system

3. A **pedestrian crossing** is estimated to cost **between £60 and £80 k**. If a pedestrian crossing were established, the underpass would be closed and the subway and ramps filled in. This would **save the Council** considerable **capital and revenue expenditure**.

4. Councillor Clarke himself has said that **repairing and maintaining the subway** would be a **very expensive option**, that he **did not want to pour 'good money down a hole in the road'**. and that **'overall I support, in principal, a crossing as opposed to the subway' (April 2016)** .

5. At a time when **Council budgets are stretched and reducing**, to choose the **much more expensive option** of an underpass does not make financial sense.

D. The subway does not address current road safety issues and standards

1. The **subway** does **not address the danger** caused by **vehicles entering the gyratory too quickly** from the east (Widcombe). This causes **frequent damage to railings and vehicles** {see photo - annex 1}. A **crossing** would **calm traffic, preventing accidents**.
2. **At present the parapet does not meet DMRB road safety standards** so might not **withstand being hit by large vehicle and** causing potential **danger to subway users**
3. **Mr Peacock cites a technical note Atkins (May 2016) suggesting** that a surface crossing would raise issues of **congestion, site lines and location**. The **SOS group working with Mr Peacock has addressed and resolved** each of these arguments.
4. **Two microsimulations** have shown there is **little impact on congestion in off peak hours**. **Traffic down Wellsway moves more smoothly** with a **crossing in place**. When **pedestrian wait times** were increased to **60 and 90 seconds in rush hour** there was a **very slight increase in travel time (10 seconds)** for those coming from **Churchill Bridge** and a **max 58 seconds additional delay** for those coming from the **A36 East**.
5. The **site lines 'blind spot' under the eastern railway arch** could be **mitigated by a) directing traffic over the existing hatched area to the east of the gyratory, making vehicles take a wider, slower route** and **b) installing improved sight railings**.
6. In relation to **location**, it is worth noting that **there is a crossing on the west side of the gyratory sited approximately 39 metres from the roundabout** with a **similar 'blind spot' under the western arch of the gyratory**. To the knowledge of the SOS group its placement has caused **no damage to people in cars, on foot or on cycles**.

E The subway does not address equal opportunities and personal safety

1. **Many people, particularly women, avoid using the subway especially at night** as they feel **their personal safety is at risk**. There have been **unpleasant incidents** in the underpass. Rough sleepers (though probably harmless) cause additional concern.
2. **To avoid using the underpass some people climb over the railings and run across the road between moving vehicles**. There is therefore an additional **safety hazard** as people **create an unofficial 'pedestrian crossing'** {see photo, Annex 1}.
3. The SOS group considers the **subway to be antisocial and discriminatory against people on foot and those with disabilities over those in vehicles**.

In summary it is a question of balance. The focus in Mr Peacock's paper is primarily on vehicles. It scarcely refers to or shows people. The SOS group's focus is on the needs of people in vehicles, on foot and on cycles. SOS therefore urges the Panel to support a road level pedestrian crossing as it:

- Would provide an **attractive entrance to our Heritage City of which we can be proud**
- Is the **residents desired option**
- Is the **financially viable capital and revenue option**
- Will be the **safer option, calming traffic and easing traffic flow down Wells Road**
- Will **safeguard personal safety by providing a road level route to and from the city**
- Will help **fulfil Bath's own 2014 Transport Strategy 'Getting around in Bath'**.

Annexes

1 Photos showing:

- the state of the subway



- people running across the road to avoid the subway



- broken railings resulting from traffic shunts on the gyratory as people enter it too quickly from the East (Widcombe side)



- I would use at 7.30 pm but not after 9.00
- Urine smell / non working lights
- I have three teenaged / early 20s children who don't use it at night. Instead they jump the railings
- I am nervous of underpass (don't use)
- The state of underpass is appalling, has been for many years
- I avoid it at night, dirty, feels unsafe.
- People are often begging, sleeping, rolled blankets left. never use at night
- Better if cars went underground instead of people
- As a senior I am rather nervous about using the underpass
- The underpass is a disgrace and does not give a good impression to tourists and visitors in a Heritage City
- Get a crossing
- The overall quality of the underpass (safety, aesthetics, construction) is well below what I expect from the City of Bath (World Heritage site and all that). As an entrance to the City or perhaps a scary late night exit from it, it is well under par, reflecting poorly on the Council.
- The underpass is the main route (by foot) into the City from Bear Flat and is unattractive to both residents and visitors. At night it feels unsafe even to reasonably fit male such as me
- What a shame Bath lets itself down with this embarrassing entrance to the City
- I would take a taxi or bus at night rather than go through the underpass
- I wouldn't go through the underpass at night - not a good introduction to a beautiful city
- I visit Bath regularly because it's such a lovely city. I stay in Bear Flat when in Bath and unfortunately find that this underpass reduces the quality of my experience
- We need a safe crossing
- I feel very unsafe in the current underpass and I want a crossing
- It's my only route into town (from Holloway) and it doesn't feel safe - make a crossing
- Fill it in and make a crossing
- Out of sight is always a problem - crossing at street level much more defensible
- It's horrible. Been down there once and never again

Annex 3 - Question and Answers relating to SOS proposals

A. Entrance to world heritage city

A (1) Question: Will a surface crossing at Claverton Street improve the entrance to our World Heritage City?

Answer: Yes

The subway is regarded as unsafe by a large majority of pedestrians who responded to SOS questionnaires (2015). Many female respondents simply will not use it because of actual or perceived danger. It is badly lit, dirty and liable to flooding and pedestrians have no sight lines which would enable them to see into and through the subway before entering it. Many pedestrians climb over the railings to cross the dual carriageway to the east of the gyratory, particularly when the subway is flooded.

A surface crossing will alleviate all of these problems and will offer residents, students and visitors a safe route into the city from the south. Pedestrians who were interviewed felt that the waiting time for a surface level crossing (90 seconds absolute maximum) would be a small price to pay for this.

A (2) Question: Will a surface level crossing at Claverton Street contribute to any other improvements to our world heritage city?

Answer: Yes

The Art in the Arches project is working to improve the visual, commercial and artistic aspects of the Brunel designed railway bridge across the gyratory. A surface crossing over the gyratory will allow pedestrians to access the arches from both north and south of the bridge. The south side of the city can and should be an attractive and thriving hub rather than a dowdy, dirty sector to avoided or walked through at a brisk pace.

B. Traffic Flow

B Question: Will the introduction of a surface crossing on the Churchill gyratory or the A36 Claverton Street approach have any impact on traffic flow?

Answer: Yes

If the crossing were on the gyratory and the traffic lights were set at 90 second waiting times for pedestrians during the afternoon rush hour, travel times down Wellsway and on the A36 from Bristol would be improved. Travel times across Churchill Bridge would be slightly increased (by 10 seconds) and by 58 seconds for traffic on the A36 from Widcombe. There would be an even smaller impact on traffic flow during the morning rush hour and no measurable impact at any other time.

No microsimulations have been undertaken to measure the impact on traffic flow of a crossing on the A36 Claverton Street with pedestrian waiting times of 60 or 90 seconds. At waiting times of 30 seconds the impact on traffic flows is significantly (60%) less than for a crossing on the gyratory.

Extrapolation of this data to 60 and 90 seconds pedestrian waiting times suggests that a surface crossing on Claverton Street would have a minimal impact on overall traffic flows into and out of the gyratory.

C. Capital and Revenue Costs

C. Question: Would a surface crossing be cheaper to install and maintain than the existing subway?

Answer: Yes

The estimated cost of carrying out the structural repair to the subway in order to alleviate flooding is £250k, to which has been added a further £65k to allow for the installation of a CCTV link and a pumped drainage system. (Total £315k). Revenue costs for ongoing maintenance (cleaning, flooding, CCTV repairs to lights, mirrors surfaces) have not been factored in

The cost of a surface crossing was estimated by Mr Peacock, at an SOS meeting on 1st June 2016 to be in the order of £60k. Ongoing maintenance costs for a surface crossing are likely to be much lower than for the subway.

D. Safety

D (1) Question: Would a surface crossing be safer for pedestrians wishing to access the city centre from the south of Bath?

Answer: Yes

Pedestrians would be able to see and be seen by other road and foot users and would both feel and be safer as a consequence.

In addition pedestrians would be able to use the crossing in all weathers. The subway is impassable after heavy rain and people often choose to climb the protective railings and cross the dual carriageway, at considerable risk to themselves.

D (2) Question: Would a surface level crossing be safer for road users (vehicles and bicycles) compared to the existing subway?

Answer: Yes

The traffic lights at a surface level crossing would slow traffic and encourage drivers to enter and leave the gyratory more carefully. Currently shunts regularly occur as the traffic travels onto the gyratory too quickly from the A36 East (Widcombe direction). A crossing would calm this area.

D (3) Question: If the surface level crossing were sited on the gyratory, would the road system be safe for drivers?

Answer: Whilst recognising that there currently are, and would continue to be, potential dangers to traffic moving round a busy gyratory, there is no evidence that the dangers would be exacerbated by the introduction of a surface crossing. Drivers would be warned that they were approaching traffic lights and would react accordingly.

A number of safety precautions could be added to the road system through the gyratory including enhanced lighting, warning signals, a speed reduction to 20 MPH, directing traffic over the existing hatched area to the east of the gyratory to make vehicles to take a wider, and slower route round the gyratory. All of these would contribute to a safer environment for both pedestrians and road users.

D (4) Question: If the surface crossing were sited on the A36, 39 metres to the east of the gyratory, would it be safe for road users?

Answer: Yes

There has long been a surface level crossing for pedestrians 39 metres to the west of the gyratory. The exit to the west of the gyratory is similar to that to the east, though with a more acute bend in the road and poorer sight lines. As far as we know, there have been no reported accidents in over 30 years as a result of the functioning of this surface crossing. The inescapable conclusion is that a surface crossing at an identical distance on the opposite side of the gyratory would be as safe as the existing one to the west.

This is supported by the comment in a report from CH2M, carried out on behalf of BANES in June 2016, which stated that a surface crossing at 44 metres from the gyratory '*could be acceptable*' with regard to safety and stopping distances.

E. Equality and Personal Safety

E Question: Would a surface crossing address any issues of equality for women and people with disabilities?

Answer : Yes

In a survey of 82 people and a petition of almost 300 people collected (in approximately 6 hours) by SOS members a significant majority of female respondents of all ages expressed concerns about using the subway during the day (58%) and at night (95%). These residents, students and visitors stated a strong preference for a surface crossing, which would make them feel safer and enable them to walk from their homes to town.

People with disabilities are simply unable to use the subway when it floods and have been forced to make a lengthy detour via the Widcombe crossing in order to access the city centre. A surface crossing would deal with this issue.

Reference number	Question	Name	Answer	Name
CT1	What is your overall ambition with regards to reducing Nitrogen Dioxide levels in the Bath AQMA during this next action plan and at what stage will you convert this ambition to quantifiable targets?	Fiona Powell	Our aim is to reduce the annual mean for nitrogen dioxide to beneath the objective limits. The final action plan (still to be developed) will include quantifiable targets for the measures that directly affect emissions or concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) and other pollutants.	Robin Spalding
CT2	You have set out a list of potential measures to consult on in Appendix C. Will you quantify the impact on Nitrogen Dioxide levels that would come from each of these options before putting them out to public consultation?	Fiona Powell	<p>Please note: these are example actions for the panel and not a complete set. The complete set will be devised for and influenced by the 12 week formal consultation process starting in May.</p> <p>Some measures will seek to reduce NO₂ emissions, others will seek to reduce NO₂ concentrations. Others such as public awareness related measures will not directly affect emissions or concentrations but may lead to improvements. Certain measures will be modelled to see what impact they will have. The action plan is a living document with annual progress reports issued to DEFRA and ongoing feasibility and modelling to steer the direction of measures.</p>	
CT3	At the Widcombe stakeholder workshop to	Mark Magri-	As detailed above - the list of actions are	

	<p>develop ideas for public consultation that I attended, participants suggested many ideas that haven't made it through to Appendix C. What criteria were applied to discount them and why can't they be on the list for public consultation? Examples of suggestions made:</p> <p>(Variable) congestion charging to generate money to invest in further measures to reduce congestion and emissions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extending residents' parking zones • Free transport for school children • Sliding scale for cost of residential parking permit based on level of emission from vehicles. E.g. Low emission = low cost • Car sharing schemes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Car Club incentives - Bus fares need to be cheaper than parking for 2/3 hours. 	Overend	<p>examples only for the Panel and have been drawn up before the completion of the initial consultation. Officers are still putting together a complete list and liaising with other external groups and relevant teams internally, in time for the consultation launch in May that will take into account the contribution from all those involved in the options generation collaboration.</p> <p>The initial collaboration phase of the work was successful and was undertaken so that members of the public could have an input at the development stages. It is our intention to include contributions collected during the collaboration phase and we thank those involved to date for their input.</p>	
CT4	<p>Appendix B shows that, other than around the bus station (Manvers St), diesel cars account for broadly one third of Nitrogen Dioxide emissions. Why does the suggested list of actions for the plan at appendix</p>	Mark Magri-Overend	<p>See above. The suggested list of actions being prepared for the consultation is incomplete at this stage.</p>	

	C not contain measures to significantly limit such car usage in the AQMA?			
CT5	<p>Re 3.4 <i>The Council recently bid to DEFRA for £285,000 to pay for officer resource and consultation fee for feasibility work and implementation of a Bath CAZ and associated 'anti-idling' initiative. This bid was unsuccessful and an alternative source of funding now needs to be identified for this work to progress.</i></p> <p>What were the reasons given by DEFRA for this bid being unsuccessful?</p>	Sian James	<p>The letter from DEFRA informing us of unsuccessful award of lot 1 bid (Clean Air Zone) stated: <i>'the Board decided that the application performed less favourably with regard to contribution to outcome criterion; that being meeting the Grant's main objective which is to help deliver compliance in areas in current and projected exceedance of UK air pollution targets in the shortest possible time.'</i></p> <p>Most of the successful bids were for larger authorities and those for which a Clean Air Zone is compulsory. Information of the successful bids is provided here: http://www.government-online.net/defra-air-quality-grant-programme-2016-2017/</p>	
CT6	<p>Re 4.2 <i>A CAZ is one of the options suggested by DEFRA in the Local Air Quality Management (LAQM) guidance as a possible measure to be included in an air quality action plan.</i></p> <p>Which other options from the LAQM 2016 does the team believe are suitable for Bath and which has it discounted from its action planning and for what reasons?</p>	Sian James	<p>See above. We are not in a position to provide a full list at the moment because Officers are still working on the development of the consultation document and this will be available for residents to comment on for a full 3 month period commencing in May 2017.</p>	

This page is intentionally left blank